## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office is requiring restriction in the above-listed application as follows:

Group I: Claims 1 (in part), 2, 7, (in part), 8-11, 12 (in part), 13, 22-23, 24 (in

part), and 25-26, drawn to a composition comprising a compound of

formula I, where X is N;

Group II: Claims 1 (in part), 7 (in part), 9-11, 12 (in part), 22-23, 24 (in part),

and 26, drawn to a composition comprising a compound of formula I,

where X is CH;

Group III: Claims 3 (in part), and 4, drawn to a method of accelerating

nuerotrophic factor production by administering to a mammal a

compound of formula I, where X is N;

Group IV: Claim (3) (in part), drawn to a method of accelerating neurotropic

factor production by administering to a mammal a compound of

formula I, where X is CH;

Group V: Claims 14-15, 16 (in part), and 17, drawn to a method of preventing or

treating a motor nervous system or peripheral nervous system disease in a mammal by administering to a mammal a compound of formula I,

where X is N; and

Group VI: Claims 14-15, and 16 (in part), drawn to a method of preventing or

treating a motor nervous system or peripheral nervous system disease in a mammal by administering to a mammal a compound of formula I,

where X is CH.

Applicants have elected, with traverse, Group V: Claims 14-15, 16 (in part) and 17, for further prosecution.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that a search of all the claims would not present and undue burden.

The MPEP, in subsection 803 states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without a serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions. Application No. 10/509,336

Reply to Restriction Requirement of April 17, 2006

Applicants submit that a search of all the claims would not impose a serious burden upon the Office and therefore request withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement.

Applicants also respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that the Office has issued many patents, such as US 6,969,713, US 6,911,448, and US 6,835,371, wherein piperidine and piperazine were examined in the same group. Given this Official precedent, Applicants submit that the methods of Groups V and VI, which respectfully employ piperidine and piperazine, should be searched at the same time. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement.

Applicants submit this application is now in condition for examination on the merits and early notification of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. Norman F. Oblon

Charles J. Andres, Ph.D. Attorney of Record

Registration No. 57,537

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{Customer Number} \\ 22850 \end{array}$ 

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04)